

**REMARKS**

These remarks are responsive to the Office Action dated December 22, 2003. Currently, Claims 1-28 are pending with Claims 1, 16, 27 and 28 being independent.

In the Office Action, dated December 22, 2003, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,628,755 to Shimada et al. (hereinafter "Shimada") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,396,920 to Cox et al. (hereinafter "Cox"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a call center that includes a customer service response system (CSRS) capable of responding to an incoming telephone call from a calling party by playing a message to the calling party, a graphical user interface (GUI) electrically coupled to the CSRS and configured to receive and display information from the CSRS, where the information received from the CSRS originates from the calling party.

In contrast, Shimada discloses "a transaction support system where speedy service can be provided to a customer based on input information and terminal status information from the customer's terminal unit." (Col. 2, lines 11-13).

Shimada describes the transaction support system in two stages. During the first stage, described in Cols. 3-6, the customer performs transactions at the terminal without contacting the customer service representative through the telephone. During the second stage, described in Cols. 7-9, when a customer needs to speak to a customer service representative he uses the telephone located beside the terminal to make the phone call.

The examiner cited Col. 5, lines 38-55 from Shimada to show that the host computer processes a received input message and sends out an output message to the terminal. The Examiner further stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made that the teaching of sending a message to the terminal unit can be modified to playing the message to the calling party in order to allow the customer service response system to have a variety of options to communicate with the customer. However, the citation given by the Examiner refers to the first stage of the transaction support system where the telephone contact with the customer service representative has not been initiated yet.

According to Shimada "when the self-service counter server 25 receives the response file sent from the telephone banking server 26, the self-service counter server 25 generates a response showing a transaction result and sends the response to the self service counter terminal via the public telephone network 50. When receiving the transaction result, the self-service counter terminal unit 10 displays the transaction result in accordance with a predetermined screen format." (Col. 5, lines 48-57) All that this illustrates is graphically displaying the output message from the self-service server at the counter terminal unit 10 not from the display unit 103, since the customer has not yet initiated contact with the customer service representative. In the first stage of Shimada, the combination of Shimada and Cox would produce a system that would fail to receive and display information from the CSRS.

Furthermore, in the first stage of the transaction support system, it would not be obvious to modify the sending of a message to the terminal to playing the message to the calling party in order for the customer service response system to have a variety of options to communicate with the customer, since the CSRS has not been activated yet and the calling party does not exist yet.

In Shimada, the second stage of the transaction support system is described in Cols. 7-9. During this stage the customer picks up the phone and calls the customer service representative. This telephone call initiates the caller and customer service representative interaction. In contrast to the present invention, in this second stage of the transaction support system, the

information that is displayed on the display unit 103 does not originate from the calling party's phone 12. Instead it originates from the computer terminal 10. (See Shimada Col. 8, lines 5-15) "Accordingly, the display unit 103 at the reception terminal unit 22a, which received the call from the customer telephone 12 located with the self-service counter terminal unit 10, shows a current screen of the self-service counter terminal unit 10 as a shown in FIG. 9. That is, the current screen displayed at the display unit 103 includes the self service counter terminal information processed in step S5, the customer information processed in step S4, the card information processed in step S6, the screen image information processed in step S2 and the operation history processed in step S3". In contrast to the present invention, Shimada teaches that the information that is displayed on the GUI originates form the computer terminal not from the calling party. Shimada does not provide a GUI which displays information from the CSRS originating from the calling party as recited in Claim 1 of the present invention. Cox does not cure this deficiency.

During the first stage of the transaction support system in Shimada, the combination of Shimada and Cox would produce a system that would fail to receive and display information from the CSRS. In addition, Cox does not cure the deficiency in the second stage of Shimada, where the information that is displayed on the GUI does not originate from the calling party as claimed in the present invention. The rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully traversed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 16, 27 and 28 were rejected for the same reasons as Claim 1 and similarly are not rendered obvious by the combination of Shimada and Cox for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claims 16, 27 and 28 is respectfully

traversed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw his rejection of claims 16, 27 and 28.

Claims 2-15 and 17-26 depend from Claims 1 and 16 respectively. As such, Claims 2-15 and 17-26 are not rendered obvious by Shimada and Cox for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to Claims 1 and 16. Therefore, the rejections of Claims 2-15 and 17-26 are traversed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw his rejections of Claims 2-15 and 17-26.

No new matter has been added.

The claims currently presented are proper and definite. Allowance is accordingly in order and respectfully requested. However, should the Examiner deem that further clarification of the record is in order, we invite a telephone call to the Applicants' undersigned attorney to expedite further processing of the application to allowance.

Date: March 24, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Richard M. Lehrer  
Reg. No.: 38, 536  
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS  
GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.  
Chrysler Center  
666 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10017  
(212) 935-3000